


ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA57698**

Filing date: **12/14/2005**

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE TRADEMARK TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Proceeding	91161817
Party	Defendant Motorola, Inc. Motorola, Inc. 1303 East Algonquin Road Schaumburg, IL 60196
Correspondence Address	Thomas M. Williams Brinks Hofer Gilson & Lione P.O. Box 10395 Chicago, IL 60610
Submission	Motion for Summary Judgment
Filer's Name	Elisa M. Valenzona
Filer's e-mail	officeactions@brinkshofer.com, evalenzona@brinkshofer.com
Signature	/elisa m. valenzona/
Date	12/14/2005
Attachments	7717-138 Ltr.pdf (3 pages)

Elisa M. Valenzona
evalenzona@brinkshofer.com
312-321-4716



**Via Electronic Filing (Letter, Motion and Memorandum)
and Express Mail (Letter and Exh. 1 and 7 only)**

December 14, 2005

Box: TTAB/NO FEE

Attn: Cheryl S. Goodman – Office G/TTAB
Commissioner for Trademarks
P.O. Box 1451
Alexandria, VA 22313-1451

**Re: Opposer: Nextel Communications, Inc.
Applicant: Motorola, Inc.
Opposition No.: 91/161,817
Mark: Sensory Mark (911 Hz tone)
Our Ref.: 7717/138**

Dear Ms. Goodman:

I am writing to confirm our conversation of today. As discussed, on November 11, 2005, we, on behalf of Applicant Motorola, Inc., filed with the TTAB Motorola's Motion for Summary Judgment and Memorandum in Support of Motorola's Motion for Summary Judgment. The Motion and Memorandum were filed via first class mail.

To date, neither Motorola's Motion nor its Memorandum appear on TTABVue as having been received by the Board. We have, however, received our stamped return-receipt postcard with the TTAB's stamp acknowledging receipt of both documents. A copy of the postcard bearing the TTAB's stamp is enclosed.


The stamped postcard leads us to believe that the Motion and Memorandum have been safely received by the Board. However, we appreciate your assistance in confirming that Motorola's documents have, in fact, been received by the Board and that they were given a filing date of November 11.

Per our conversation, out of an abundance of caution and to provide the Board with electronic access to Motorola's documents, we are today electronically filing a copy of the Motion and Memorandum with the Board via ESTTA. All of the Exhibits will be included in the filing, except for Exhibit 1 and 7 that consists of CD-Roms with the sound marks at issue. Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 7 are enclosed with this letter.

Cheryl S. Goodman
December 14, 2005
Page 2

Again, we thank you for your assistance in this matter. Please let me know if you need any further information or materials.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Elisa M. Valenzona". The signature is fluid and extends to the right with a long, sweeping tail.

Elisa M. Valenzona

cc: Michael Jacobs, Esq., Counsel for Opposer Nextel (via email w/o encl.)

Enclosures

Case No.: 7717 138
Opposer/Applicant: Nextel Communications, Inc. v.
Motorola, Inc.
Opposition No.: 91/161,817
Mark: Sensory Mark (911 Hz tone)

ATTN: Box TTAB NO FEE
Commissioner for Trademarks
P.O. Box 1451
Alexandria, VA 22313-1451

Please acknowledge receipt of the below-identified
Transmittal Letter; Memorandum in Support of Applicant's Motion For Summary
Judgment; Applicant's Motion For Summary Judgment, and this return receipt
postcard
DATED: 11/11/05



11-15-2005

U.S. Patent & TM Office TM Mail Rcpt Dt 7/64